IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE SECOND DAY OF FEBRUARY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE K.C. BHANU

WRIT PETITION NO : 1293 of 2005

Between:

G.Sanyasi Rao, S/o.late Jagga Rao,
R/o.Door No.32-4-66, BHPV Post, Visakhapatnam-12.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 Visakhapatnam Steel Plant, rep.by its Chairman & Managing Director, Visakhapatnam.
2 The Special Deputy Collector, Land Acquisition, Steel Plant, Visakhapatnam.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction more particularly one in the nature of a writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the first respondent in not releasing the offer of appointment and not disposing of the petitioner's representation dated 10-11-2004 as arbitrary and illegal and consequently direct the respondents to appoint the petitioner as Junior Technician with all consequential benefits with effect from 1992 and pass such other order or orders.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.S.SATYAM REDDY

Counsel for the Respondents: MR.V.RAJAGOPAL REDDY, S.C.

The Court made the following :

ORAL ORDER:

This writ petition is filed seeking a Mandamus to declare the action of the 1st respondent in not disposing of the petitioner's representation, dated 10.11.2004 as illegal and arbitrary.

Heard the learned counsel for both the parties and perused the material on record.

The learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner is a displaced employee in the establishment of Steel Plant and his name has not been considered for employment in the post of Junior Technician. It is further contended that the 1st respondent did not sponsor the names of any candidates from employment exchange for filling up of the posts meant for the displaced employees. Therefore, he prays to direct the 1st respondent to consider the petitioner's representation and appoint him as Junior Technician.

On the other hand, the learned counsel for the 1st respondent has contended that depending upon the availability of the vacancies, those posts will be notified and after issuance of notification,

preference will be given to the petitioner. It is further contended that a special employment exchange has been created for the purpose of providing employment to the displaced persons, therefore, respondents will sponsor the name of the petitioner depending upon the availability of vacancies and take appropriate decision on the petitioner's representation.

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, I consider it appropriate to direct the respondents to consider the representation, dated 10.11.2004 made by the petitioner depending upon the availability of vacancies.

The writ petition is disposed of in terms of the above direction. However, this order will not preclude the employment exchange from sending the petitioner's name whenever the 1st respondent calls for in pursuance of any notification that may be issued. In the circumstance of the case, there shall be no order as to costs.

(K.C. BHANU, J.)

2nd February, 2005.

bcj

To

1 The Chairman and Managing Director, Visakhapatnam Steel Plant, Visakhapatnam.
2 The Special Deputy Collector, Land Acquisition, Steel Plant, Visakhapatnam.

3. Two C.D. copies